Case 3:07-cv-00076-LRH-RAM Document 31 Filed 06/11/2007 Page 1 of 3 **ELECTRONICALLY FILED: 06/07/07** Kent R. Robison, Esq. (Bar No. 1167) 1 Clayton P. Brust, Esq. (Bar No. 5234) Jennifer L. Baker, Esq. (Bar No.9559) 2 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street 3 Reno, Nevada 89503 Telephone: (775) 329-3151 4 Facsimile: (775) 329-7941 Attorneys for Defendants 5 Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and Successors 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 10 DA-DAZE-NOM MANZANARES, 11 Plaintiff, 12 CASE NO. 07-CV-00076-LRH-RAM VS. 13 ELKO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, and GARY LEE JONES, SR., as agent for ELKO 14 COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, and GARY LEE JONES, SR., individually, and CORPORATION 15 OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-16 DAY SAINTS, a foreign corporation registered to do business in the State of Nevada; 17 CORPORATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-18 DAY SAINTS AND SUCCESSORS, a foreign 19 corporation registered to do business in the State of Nevada; and Does 1-5, and XYZ Corporations 20 1-5. 21 Defendants. 22 23 STIPULATION AND REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS; ORDER 24 25 Defendants Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-26 Day Saints and Corporation of the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints 27 and Successors, ("The Church"), and Plaintiff Da-Daze-Nom Manzanares, hereby stipulate to 28 and request an order granting leave for The Church to file a reply in support of its motion to

Case 3:07-cv-00076-LRH-RAM Document 31 Filed 06/11/2007 Page 2 of 3

dismiss (Docket #15). The Church did not receive a copy of Plaintiff's opposition (Docket #22) to The Church's motion to dismiss, either electronically or otherwise, when the opposition was filed on May 14, 2007. (Brust aff. ¶2). The Church is unaware of why it did not receive a copy of Plaintiff's opposition, and certainly is not laying any fault with Plaintiff for not receiving the opposition. (Brust aff. ¶3). Further, The Church is currently investigating why it has not received any of the other filings, electronic or otherwise, from the other parties in this matter. (Brust aff. ¶3). The only reason The Church failed to file a reply in support of its motion to dismiss pursuant to timing requirements set forth by the local rules is because The Church was unaware that an opposition had been filed. (Brust aff. ¶4). Accordingly, the parties respectfully request leave of the Court to allow The Church to file a reply in support of its motion to dismiss no later than June 11, 2007.

So Stipulated:

DATED this 7 day of June, 2007.

ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW

A Professional Corporation 71 Washington Street Reno, Nevada 89503

By:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

KENT R. ROBISON CLAYTON P. BRUST JENNIFER L. BAKER Attorneys for Defendants

Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of The Church of Jesus Christ of

Latter-Day Saints and

Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day

Saints and Successors

DATED this 4 day of June, 2007.

MARVEL & KUMP, LTD.

217 Idaho Street P.O. Box 2645

Elko, NV 89803-2645

By:

JEFFREY J. KUMP, ESQ.

Attorney for Plaintiff

Da-Daze-Nom Manzanares

ORDER

The Court, having reviewed the Stipulation and Request for Leave to file Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss, and good cause appearing therefore, hereby grants the request. Defendants Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and Corporation of the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and Successors shall have until June 11, 2007 to file and serve a reply in support of their motion to dismiss (Docket #15).

DATED this 11th day of June, 2007.

Eldihi

LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE